

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending with claims 1, 6, 12, 17, 21, 23, and 29 being independent.
Claims 1, 6, 12-16, 20, and 26 have been amended.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 22 and 30 are directed to allowable subject matter.

Independent claims 1, 6 and 12 have been rejected along with dependent claims 3-5, 7, 9-11, 13-14, and 16 as being anticipated by Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 6,474,826).

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to recite "a light guiding plate having an upper surface for emitting light, a first side surface and a second side surface," "a point light source facing an intersection of said first side surface and said second side surface," and "a reflecting member for reflecting a light of said point source, wherein the reflecting member covers a portion of said first side surface and a portion of said second side surface." Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in Fig. 8. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 6 and their dependent claims because Tanaka does not describe or suggest the recited reflecting member.

In Tanaka, the reflector 50, which the Examiner equates to the claimed reflecting member, is arranged on both the upper and the lower surfaces of the light source rod 10 (Figs. 4 and 5, col. 4, lines 6-14). The light source rod 10 is integrally formed with the light guide plate 20, which the Examiner equates to the claimed light guiding plate. Accordingly, reflector 50 does not cover a portion of the first and second side surfaces of light guide plate 20. For at least these reasons, applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 6, and the claims that depend from them.

Claim 12, as amended, recites "a light guiding plate having a first side surface, a second side surface, and an inclined surface between said first side surface and said second side surface" and a point light source that faces the inclined surface. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 and its dependent claims because Tanaka does not describe or suggest the recited light guiding plate.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Tanaka describes inclined surfaces 13 in reference to Figs. 11-15. However, Tanaka does not describe or suggest a light guiding plate having the recited inclined surface. Instead, Figs. 11-15 illustrate lighting apparatuses with inclined surfaces 13 that do not face a point light source. For at least this reason, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 and its dependent claims.

Independent claims 17, 21, and 23, and dependent claims 18, 24, 27, and 28, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Maegawa (U.S. Patent No. 4,954,930) in view of Fukiharu.

Claims 17 and 23 recite "a second light guiding plate ... not in contact with said first light guiding plate." Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17 and 23 and their dependent claims because neither Maegawa, Fukiharu, nor or any combination of the two, describes or suggests the recited second light guiding plate.

As discussed in the previous response, Maegawa's illuminating portion 2a, which the Examiner equates to the second light guiding plate, is in contact with the light receiving portion 4 of light guide 1, which the Examiner equates to the first light guiding plate (Fig. 2 of Maegawa). Fukiharu does not overcome the deficiencies of Maegawa. In particular, light guides 2, 12, and 22 do not include the recited second light guiding plate. For at least these reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17 and 23, and the claims that depend from them.

Claim 21 recites "a first light guiding plate ... wherein said first light guiding plate has a larger refractive index than said second light guiding plate." As discussed in the prior response, neither Maegawa, Fukiharu, nor or any combination of the two, describes or suggests the recited first light guiding plate.

Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 and its dependent claims,

Independent claim 29 and dependent claims 30-32 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Hoshi (U.S. Patent No. 6,020,944) in view of Fukiharu.

Claim 29 recites a liquid crystal display device including a first light guiding plate and a second light guiding plate "wherein said first light guiding plate has a larger refractive index than

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

said second light guiding plate.” Neither Hoshi, Fukiharu, nor ant combination of the two, describes or suggests the claimed liquid crystal display device.

The Examiner states that “Hoshi discloses an illumination device and LCD apparatus including ... a first light guiding plate (21) ... [and] a second light guiding plate (31).” As discussed in the prior response, the Examiner is equating light guide member 21 of the first embodiment of the invention in Hoshi (Fig. 3 of Hoshi, col. 7, line 39 to col. 10, line 44) with the claimed first light guiding plate and is equating light guide member 31 of the second embodiment of the invention of Hoshi (Fig. 6 of Hoshi, col. 10, line 45 to col. 12, line 31) with the claimed second light guiding plate. The light guide member 21 and the light guide member 31 are, therefore, parts of two separate and independent embodiments and are, therefore, not described as being present together in any single device or apparatus in Hoshi. Accordingly, Hoshi does not disclose a liquid crystal display device having both a first light guiding plate and a second light guiding plate. Furthermore, while Hoshi does describe refractive index differences between the anisotropic substrate 22 and the non-anisotropic layer 23, Hoshi does not teach that the light guide member 21 has a larger refractive index than the light guide member 31.

Fukiharu does not overcome the deficiencies of Hoshi. In particular, light guides 2, 12, and 22 do not include the recited second light guiding plate.

For at least these reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 29 and the claims that depend from it.

Dependent claims 2, 8, and 15, which depend from independent claims 1, 6, and 12, respectively, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Hoshi. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 6, and 12, Tanaka does not describe or suggest the recited reflecting member and light guiding plate.

Hoshi does not overcome the deficiencies of Tanaka. In particular, Hoshi does not describe or suggest the reflecting member recited in claims 1 and 6 or the light guiding plate recited in claim 12. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 8, and 15.

Applicant : Hajime Kimura, et al.
Serial No. : 09/833,397
Filed : April 11, 2001
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-273001 / US4846

NOT AVAILABLE COPY

Dependent claims 19 and 20, which depend from independent claim 17, and dependent claims 25 and 26, which depend from independent claim 23, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Maegawa in view of Fukiharu and further in view of Hoshi. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 17 and 23, neither Maegawa, Fukiharu, nor any combination of the two, describes or suggests the second light guiding plate recited in claims 17 and 23.

Hoshi does not overcome the deficiencies of Maegawa and Fukiharu. In particular, Hoshi also does not describe or suggest the second light guiding plate. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19, 20, 25, and 26.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a \$110 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

2/6/04



Roberto J. Devoto
Reg. No. P55,108

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331